

REMARKS

The objection to the specification under 35 USC 112 is respectfully traversed as being moot in view of the amendments.

The various trademarks have been flagged with the ™ symbol.

The various hyperlinks have been deleted where they refer to a source of information.

When a hyperlink is used in the disclosure as an example, an alternative approach has been followed. Applicants have inserted a "dummy" hyperlink that illustrates the point being made but is not an actual hyperlink. For example, the link <http://www.cyberphile.co.uk/~taff/taffnet/mabinogion/mabinogion.htm> has been replaced with [http://\(link to \) mabinogion.htm](http://(link to) mabinogion.htm), which transmits the desired information but is not an actual link.

This substitution has been explained in the amendment to page 26.

The rejection of claims 8, 21, 12 and 25 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, is respectfully traversed.

The requirement set forth in claim 8 that the physical document can take any of a number of forms is supported in page 18, last paragraph.

In the preferred embodiment, as illustrated in Figures 1 and 2, the physical document (e.g. 202), described on page 19, lines 17 - 23, is positioned at the bottom of a stack, with the opto-touch foil above it.

Thus, in the embodiment specified in claims 8 or 21, the physical document, which may be opaque, will be illuminated from above by the TOLED film described on page 21, or by other means such as ambient light.

Thus, the Examiner's objection that it is not clear "how putting something on top (as per the specification) permits visualization is answered by the requirement in claim 1 that the structure put on top of the physical document is an opto-touch foil. By definition, the opto-touch foil permits light to pass.

The opto-touch foil is defined for purposes of this specification on page 19, lines 17 - 18.

With regard to claims 12 and 25, Applicants have rewritten the claims to recite the steps of the cited method.

The rejection of claims 8, 21, 25 and 26 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, is respectfully traversed.

The "such as" problem in claims 8 and 21 has been fixed by deleting the listed examples.

Claim 26 has been referred specifically to claim 25. Hardware is specifically recited and the dependence is no longer in the preamble.

The objections to claims 8 and 16 are respectfully traversed.

The multiple dependence of claim 8 has been corrected.

Claim 16 has been corrected.

For the foregoing reasons, allowance of the claims is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

by: 
Eric W. Petraske, Attorney
Registration No. 28,459
Tel. (203) 798-1857